

UNCLASSIFIED

EIO

RELEASED IN FULL

Stewart, Michael P

From: Elizabeth Irvin [Elizabeth.Irvin@sierraclub.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2010 3:32 PM
To: Schroeder, Anne T; orlandoea@state.gov; Byla, Robert K
Cc: Stewart, Michael P
Subject: letter to Secretary Clinton regarding Keystone XL
Attachments: Keystone XL letter to Clinton (8-17).pdf

Dear Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Goldwyn, and Ms. Orlando

Below and attached, please find a copy of a letter sent to Secretary Clinton by EARTHWORKS, Friends of the Earth, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, and Western Organization of Resource Councils requesting additional information about the NEPA process and National Interest Determination for the Keystone XL project. We would appreciate the Department of State's thorough response to our concerns. Thank you for your consideration in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Irvin
Apprentice, Sierra Club
(202) 548-4598

**EARTHWORKS • FRIENDS OF THE EARTH • NATIONAL WILDLIFE
FEDERATION • NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL • SIERRA CLUB •
WESTERN ORGANIZATION OF RESOURCE COUNCILS**

August 16, 2010

The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton
Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State
Harry S. Truman Building
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520
Dear Madam Secretary:

We are writing to you as stakeholders and concerned organizations to request further information about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the Keystone XL Pipeline Project. This project has serious implications for our nation's energy future and for the safety of communities across the United States. Our analysis shows that we do not need this pipeline, that its environmental risks are too high and that it is not in the national interest to expand U.S. dependence on tar sands oil. Therefore, we ask that the process for analyzing the environmental impacts of the project be carried out in a more thorough and transparent process.

We ask that the DOS act in accordance with the Administration's commitment to transparency in government and immediately make public all comments on the Draft EIS, as well as any letters concerning the pipeline project timing, process or national interest determination.

In order to adequately analyze the project, we ask that the Department of State (DOS)

UNCLASSIFIED

prepare a revised Draft EIS that includes a new and full public comment period. Both the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Department of Energy (DOE) requested substantial additional information in their comments and both the EPA comments and the July 2, 2010 letter from Chairman Waxman recommended that DOS prepare a revised Draft EIS. In the revised Draft EIS, the DOS should also now address the critical pipeline safety considerations that are no longer being assessed by the Department of Transportation (DOT).

In its comments on the Draft EIS, the EPA recommended that substantial additional information be gathered and included in a revised Draft EIS to be "circulated for full public review. The DOE also recommended substantial additional analysis. We ask for written confirmation that DOS will prepare all of the additional information requested by the EPA, DOE, and any other consulted agencies in a revised Draft EIS. DOS should further confirm when the revised Draft EIS will likely be released, and that there will be sufficient opportunity for public comment on the new draft.

This revised Draft EIS should also address pipeline safety issues, as the DOT is no longer conducting a separate environmental assessment. Given the recent serious pipeline leaks, it is especially critical that the DOS provide additional analysis in the new DEIS that details options for pipeline thickness, quality, construction, operating procedures, and potential environmental risks in the context of the more corrosive and dirtier bitumen from the tar sands. At a minimum, DOS should impose the additional conditions that the DOT was developing for the project (outlined in PHMSA's grant of Special Permit to Keystone I) as conditions of a presidential permit. In addition, although TransCanada has withdrawn its application for a special permit to run Keystone XL at a higher pressure, they have said they would likely apply for this special permit in the future. In order to decrease the risk borne by landowners along the right of way, the DOS should place a cap on pipeline capacity for this project.

The DOS should demonstrate that all the concerns of EPA, DOE other agencies, Tribes and the public have been addressed in the revised Draft EIS, and that each cooperating agency's expertise has been effectively integrated into that document. We respectfully request immediate release of all comments submitted on the Draft EIS and written confirmation that a revised Draft EIS will be prepared and will be available for full public review. The decision about whether or not to permit this pipeline should be made in accordance with the transparency pledges of the Obama Administration, and with a thorough understanding of the potential safety concerns, environmental issues, and human health risks associated with the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.

Sincerely,

Lauren Pagel
Policy Director
EARTHWORKS

David Hirsch
Managing Director
Friends of the Earth

Corry Westbrook
Legislative Director

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

National Wildlife Federation

Susan Casey-Lefkowitz
Director International Program
Natural Resources Defense Council

Debbie Sease
National Campaign Director
Sierra Club

Sara Kendall
DC Office Director
Western Organization of Resource Councils

cc: Senator John Kerry, Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
Representative Howard Berman, Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs
The Honorable James Steinberg, Deputy Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State
Elizabeth Orlando, Keystone XL Project Manager, U.S. Department of State
David Goldwyn, Office of Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, U.S. Department
of State

UNCLASSIFIED